



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

M.L

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/190,309	11/12/1998	DANIEL R. SCHNEIDEWEND	RCA89.041	6495
7590 JOSEPH S TRIPOLI PATENT OPERATIONS GE AND RCA LICENSING MANAGEMENT OPERATION INC PO BOX 5312 PRINCETON, NJ 085435312		EXAMINER SALCE, JASON P		
		ART UNIT 2623	PAPER NUMBER	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	01/16/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/190,309	SCHNEIDEWEND ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jason P. Salce	2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/30/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The claim amendments do not overcome the prior art of record (see rejection below).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 10-11, 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Young et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,479,268).

Referring to claim 1, Young discloses a processor (see Figures 22A and 22B and Column 12, Lines 38-52) for providing an EPG (see Figure 1), wherein the television receiver includes a processor (see CPU 228 in Figure 22A) and stores a program schedule (see Column 12, Lines 64-67), the EPG operable by a user to select a first program and a second program (see Figure 1) received from corresponding program sources (see Figure 1 for the first program NEWS coming from channel/source CNN and the second program Jane Wallace coming from channel/source LIF (Lifetime channel)) and to select a first program processing function for the first program and to select a second program processing function for the second program (see Figure 2 and

Column 5, Lines 37-38 and Column 7, Lines 24-30 for selecting programs to be recorded).

Young also discloses a tuner (see tuner 202 in Figure 22A) operable by the processor to receive for the first program, first current time reference information from a first corresponding program source (see Column 12, Lines 58-61 for receiving EPG information and Figure 1 for the EPG information containing programs, which are displayed for a specific time period (for example see Figure 1 for Lunch Box being broadcast at 12:00 PM) from a particular programming source (see Figure 1 for channel CNN, which is a broadcast source), wherein the first current time reference information provides information for synchronizing a scheduling clock with a clock of the first corresponding program source (see Column 12, Line 58 through Column 13, Line 24 for using the incoming EPG information (which includes current time reference information for each program from each program (channel) source) to synchronize the scheduling clock (clock used to determine when to trigger a recording event) with a clock of the first corresponding program source (the time in the EPG data used to determine what time and channel to start the recording function)).

Young also discloses that the tuner operable by the processor also receives for the second program, second current time reference information from a second corresponding program source (see again Column 12, Lines 58-61 and Figure 1 Jane Wallace being broadcast from source LIF at 11:00 AM), wherein the second current time reference information provides information for synchronizing a scheduling clock with a clock of the first corresponding program source (see Column 12, Line 58 through

Column 13, Line 24 for using the incoming EPG information (which includes current time reference information for each program from each program (channel) source) to synchronize the scheduling clock (clock used to determine when to trigger a recording event) with a clock of the first corresponding program source (the time in the EPG data used to determine what time and channel to start the recording function)). Further note Figure 4, which shows that multiple programs on multiple channels can be scheduled for recording, therefore a first and second program with two different clocks from two different sources can provide information for synchronizing a scheduling clock.

Young also discloses that the processor is programmed to derive a first scheduling clock based on the first current time reference information, the first scheduling clock synchronized with the clock of the first corresponding program source (see Column 13, Lines 14-17 for saving the record time in RAM 236, therefore deriving a first scheduling clock that is synchronized with the clock of the first program source (sent in the EPG data)).

Young also discloses that the processor is programmed to initiate the first program processing function based upon the first scheduling clock (see Column 13, Lines 17-22).

Young also discloses that the processor is programmed to derive a second scheduling clock based on the second current time reference information, the second scheduling clock synchronized with the clock of the second corresponding program source (see Column 13, Lines 14-17 for saving the record time in RAM 236, therefore deriving a first scheduling clock that is synchronized with the clock of the second

Art Unit: 2623

program source (sent in the EPG data)). Further note Figure 4, which shows that multiple programs on multiple channels can be scheduled for recording, therefore a first and second program with two different clocks from two different sources can provide information for synchronizing a scheduling clock.

Young also discloses that the processor is programmed to initiate the second program processing function based upon the second scheduling clock (see Column 13, Lines 17-22).

Referring to claims 2, Young discloses that the current time reference information (the start and end time of a program in the received EPG data (see the rejection of claim 1)) provides a current time-of-day indication (see again Figure 1 for NEWS starting at 11:00 AM, which is a current time of day (the time the program is currently being broadcasted)).

Referring to claim 4, Young discloses that the first programming processing function is at least one selected from the group consisting of a record function (see the rejection of claim 1).

Referring to claim 5, Young discloses that the group of claim 4, further consists program decoding (see Column 13, Lines 60-61).

Referring to claim 6, Young discloses that the processor is programmed to terminate the second program processing function based upon the second scheduling clock (see Column 13, Lines 14-22 for recording a program according to its start time and length, wherein the length allows the processor to calculate when to stop the recording at the end of the television program).

Referring to claim 10, see the rejection of claim 2.

Referring to claim 11, see the rejection of claim 1 for providing a scheduling clock, which is a setting to record a television program, which indicates what time and day to record a program.

Referring to claim 13, Young discloses that the tuner is operable to receive the first current time reference information from a first corresponding program source that is a broadcast source (see Column 12, Lines 58-62).

Referring to claim 14, Young discloses that the system comprises a central scheduling clock (see Column 13, Lines 3-24).

Young also discloses that the processor is programmed to provide the first scheduling clock by updating the central scheduling clock with time information generated based on the first current time reference information (see Column 13, Lines 14-24).

Young also discloses that the processor is programmed to provide the second scheduling clock by updating the central scheduling clock with time information generated based on the first current time reference information (see Column 13, Lines 14-24).

Referring to claim 15, Young discloses that the processor is programmed to maintain, for at least a period of time, both the first and second scheduling clock (see again Column 13, Lines 13-24 for maintaining the scheduled times (first and second scheduling clock for a first and second program, respectively) until the system clock 230 matches the scheduled program times (transmitted with the EPG information)).

Referring to claims 16-17, see the rejection of claims 1-2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,479,268) in view of Roop et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,619,274).

Referring to claim 3, Young discloses that the system further comprises a display for displaying a current time-of-day to a user (see the current time 11:25A being displayed to a user in Figure 1)

Young fails to disclose that the processor is operable to provide an output for updating the display of the current time-of-day based upon the first current time reference information and a filter for filtering the output to inhibit a discontinuous change in the current time reference information from causing a discontinuous change in the display of the current time-of-day and for providing the filtered output to the display.

Roop discloses a filter for filtering said output such that any discontinuity in the current time reference information is prevented and displaying the updated time to the user (see the Daylight Savings Time Change Command in Column 39 and note that automatically changing the current time according to the corrected Daylight Savings time prevents any possible discontinuity), and providing said filtered output to said display (see Column 40, Lines 19-22).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify EPG data receiving system, as taught by Young, to include the daylight savings data, as taught by Roop, for the purpose of displaying schedule data for time periods that contain the correct adjusted local time (see Column 40, Lines 21-22 of Roop).

Referring to claim 18, see the rejection of claim 3.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,479,268) in view of the Program and System Information Protocol for Terrestrial Broadcast and Cable document (herein referred to as the ATSC document) in further view of Landis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,561,461).

Referring to claim 7, Young discloses that the tuner is operable to receive EPG data from various types of means and further notes that "Other means of delivering schedule information can be employed, including the use of a subcarrier channel on the cable service", however, Young fails to teach that the tuner receives STT data that includes a time reference indicator and associated correction data sufficient to establish a time of transmission of a program by a corresponding broadcast source accurate to within about plus or minus 4 seconds.

The ATSC document teaches that a current time reference information comprises a System Time Table (SST) data of an MPEG compliant data stream (see Pages 1 and 11-12), and wherein said stored program schedule is derived from an Event Information Table (EIT) of an MPEG compliant data stream (see Pages 1 and 11-12).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the data transmitted from the servers in packetized form, as taught by Roop, to adhere to the MPEG standard with STT and EIT tables, for the purpose of providing a collection of hierarchically arranged tables for describing system information and program guide data (see Page 11, Lines 1-2 of the ATSC document).

Young and the ATSC document fail to teach that the time of transmission is correct to within about plus or minus 4 seconds.

Landis also discloses a television receiver that is capable of receiving a time correction command, which is accurate to within seconds, therefore teaching accurate to within about plus or minus 4 seconds (see Column 3, Lines 1-7).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the television receiver, as taught by Roop and the ATSC document, using the enhanced television receiver that receives a time correction command, as taught by Landis, for the purpose of maintaining accurate time (see Column 6, Lines 6-8 of Landis).

6. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,479,268) in view of the Program and System Information Protocol for Terrestrial Broadcast and Cable document (herein referred to as the ATSC document).

Referring to claim 12, Young discloses that the tuner is operable to receive EPG data from various types of means and further notes that "Other means of delivering schedule information can be employed, including the use of a subcarrier channel on the cable service", however, Young fails to teach that the first and second current time reference information comprises STT data of an MPEG compliant data stream, and the stored program schedule is derived from an EIT of an MPEG compliant data stream.

The ATSC document teaches that a current time reference information comprises a System Time Table (SST) data of an MPEG compliant data stream (see Pages 1 and 11-12), and wherein said stored program schedule is derived from an Event Information Table (EIT) of an MPEG compliant data stream (see Pages 1 and 11-12).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the data transmitted to the television receivers, as taught by Young, to adhere to the MPEG standard with STT and EIT tables, for the purpose of providing a collection of hierarchically arranged tables for describing system information and program guide data (see Page 11, Lines 1-2 of the ATSC document).

7. Claims 8-9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,479,268) in view of Usui et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,808,694).

Referring to claim 8, Young discloses that the tuner is operable to receive first current time reference information that is based on a first time-of-day clock, and that the tuner is operable to receive second current time reference information, however, Young is silent as to receiving EPG information (second current time reference information) based on a second time-of-day clock, with the second time-of-day clock being unsynchronized with the first time-of-day clock.

Usui teaches receiving first and second current time reference information (EPG information) from two separate sources (see Column 17, Lines 8-22 and Figure 22).

Further note that Usui teaches that in the U.S.A. that time information is included in the EPG information (see Column 5, Lines 45-51 and Column 17, Line 60 through Column 18, Line 5), therefore the first and second current time reference information (EPG information transmitted from separate source) are clearly based on a first and second time-of-day clock, wherein the clocks are inherently unsynchronized because they are transmitted from two distinct sources/locations.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the television receiver, as taught by Young, using the multiple EPG receiver functionality, as taught by Usui, for the purpose of allowing operability to be improved and a desired program to be selected in a short time and at a high degree of reliability (see Column 18, Lines 18-20 of Usui).

Referring to claim 9, see the rejection of claim 8.

Referring to claim 19, see the rejection of claim 8.

Conclusion

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason P. Salce whose telephone number is (571) 272-7301. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jason P Salce
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2623

January 9, 2007

JASON SALCE
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER

